



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

intentionem hodie studiumque discipulorum huius saeculi exigunt ac postulant, quare etiam magis necesse est nos magistros intellegere quibus de causis validis studium linguae Latinae inter haec multa necessario adnumerandum sit. Quamobrem oportet nos semper paratos esse ad rationem appositam exhibendam, si quis nos roget, 'Quare tandem contendis oportere iuvenes hodie studio linguae Latinae operam dare?'.

Sed finem faciam. Ex omnibus quae dixi benevolenter atque aequo animo patiamini me vos monere duobus esse opus praepositis: primum necesse est nos fidem habere validam in vi et virtute studi linguae litterarumque et Graecorum et Romanorum, ac deinde nos hanc fidem quae in nobis sita sit impavide atque intrepide ubique et cotidie praedicare ac palam sine metu efferre.

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

THEODORE A. MILLER

MR. BROWN'S "LATIN IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS"

(Concluded from page 160)

The table showing the rank in Latin in 1915-1916 of Freshmen who had entered College from the Schools investigated by Mr. Brown and the average rank in Latin of all Freshmen in the same Colleges is given by Mr. Brown to prove that the Schools of New Hampshire are doing at least as good work in Latin as those of the country as a whole. The figures are so small, however, that they prove nothing. Only 39 New Hampshire Freshmen are counted, and Dartmouth and Bates are the only institutions in which there were more than five of them. If the table proves anything, it proves that the Schools are not so inefficient in their handling of Latin as Mr. Brown's tests seem to indicate. The folly of inference from a small number of instances is well illustrated in the comment on the record of the Freshmen from one School, which sent three students to College in 1915. Two went to Amherst, where their average in Latin was about five per cent. below the general average; the third went to Bates, where his average was 15 per cent. above the general average, and 15 per cent. below the average of the six students from New Hampshire. Now, Mr. Brown's tests show this same School scoring in the fourth year above the average of the Schools using the Translation Method, in all of the five significant particulars. Yet the record of its three graduates in College is cited as a poor showing for the Grammatical Method.

Mr. Brown's animadversions on the effect of the study of Latin upon pupils' English are so violent and dogmatical, and he so palpably neglects essential factors as to make one feel that the whole investigation may be vitiated by an unscientific haste in reasoning or by antecedent bias. He maintains that "Latin as taught is a positive detriment to the learning of English", affirming, on what evidence of consentient opinion I cannot guess, that this fact is well known to Superintendents of Schools and Principals. But this is not all. He finds in his own test an abundance of

facts to prove that Latin does not, for most pupils, promote "logical thinking, power of exact statement, facility and precision in the use of English and similar abilities". It must be admitted that the evidence he presents does not prove the contrary, but that is another matter. It may be that nothing is proved, except that the test was not of such a sort or so set as to afford real evidence of any sort; or that the pupils whom he tested have not seriously studied Latin at all; or that the nature of our civilization and our educational practice unfit pupils to reason and write clearly. Even if Mr. Brown's test was a reasonable one, we still need to know whether the pupils he tested could have shown a higher ability in logic and in expression, if tested on similar material in some other subject. We need to know also whether pupils who had had no Latin could have shown a higher ability in some test equally adapted to both classes.

We are not told how long a time was allowed for the translation which Mr. Brown judges as English, and this, as I have already pointed out, is a most important consideration. The passage set was from Caesar's Civil War, 2.23-26, "with a few slight adaptations <and large omissions>", and was the same for all classes above the first. 21 Schools were tested, how many pupils we are not told. The vocabulary is open to the same criticism that I have made on the other test in connected Latin, with the addition that there are words all through the passage that even the second year pupil could not be expected to know. A good instance is *appellere*, 'to put in', which, moreover, is found in the same sentence with *appellare*. This *appellere* is the verb of a brief portion of the text, the mistranslation of which is held up as a horrible example. Another such portion contains *statio*, 'anchorage', and *eminentibus promunturiis*. You cannot ask even school-boys and school-girls to reason exactly and write correctly about things they do not understand. The last fourteen lines of the thirty-four of this Test formed the passage set by the College Entrance Examination Board in 1916 on the paper in Second Year Latin. The meaning of five words was given. The allowance of time was sufficient, and it is my recollection that the rendering was fairly satisfactory English idiom. 68.5 per cent. of the 2,115 books were given a rating of 60 or higher, 80.7 a rating of 50 or higher, 5.8 a rating from 90 to 100.

In one of the Schools in which the tests were given the average number of minutes per week devoted to the study of Latin throughout the four years was 240. In other words, pupils in this School were spending 576 hours on Latin in the four years—only 36 hours more than the boys at Exeter give to it in the first year alone. 240 minutes is the minimum for the Schools examined by Mr. Brown; the maximum is 790. The middle allotment in the lower half is 418 minutes, and in the upper half 565. Mr. Brown speaks of those Schools which devote an excessive amount of time to Latin, but does not indicate where the excess begins. Though better results are shown by the Schools which spend the greater amount of time on the subject, they are not enough better to satisfy

him. He would have them reduce the time they give to Latin and improve their methods of instruction.

Do the variations in such tests as these tell us whether there is a proper relation between time spent and achievement? And just what should be the superiority in score for each additional hour a week? One point is clearly established, that the group of Schools which employ the Translation Method, though they give less time to Latin than the other groups, get a comparatively satisfactory result, measured by these tests. Yet there is little difference in the time spent in class, and it is probable that the time supposed to be spent in study at home or at School is wasted through misdirection of effort or lack of supervision. At any rate, the tests show no substantial knowledge of grammar, to which Mr. Brown assumes that the additional time is devoted.

One of the most valuable chapters of the book is that in which Mr. Brown discusses the waste and hindrance due to keeping together pupils of widely differing ability. He admits that the single test which he used in this connection may not be a sure guide in the classification of pupils. He is undoubtedly right in holding that a classification according to ability can be made on the basis of a sufficient number of adequate tests, and there cannot be the slightest doubt that his criticism of the prevailing practice is justified by the facts. In every class there are those who cannot be expected to do the full work of the class, and those who are able to do much more than the normal assignment.

An improvement in this regard is surely desirable, but the reform proposed by Mr. Brown is itself clumsy, and might cause a greater loss than the present arrangement. He would have the classification determined by ability, after the first year, rather than dictated by a fixed course of graded reading. In one year Caesar would be read by all pupils of the highest ability; in another year, Cicero; and in the third year, Vergil. In other years these authors would be in the hands of those of the lowest ability, and in still other years they would fall to the medial class. At regular intervals, therefore, the slow second year pupil would be forced to grapple with Vergil and Cicero, and at regular intervals the fast fourth year pupil would read Caesar. The reading could not be regulated to correspond to the stage reached by the pupil, since there would be pupils at all three stages in all three classes. Other similar difficulties will be apparent at once. The plan does not fit in with the scheme of College Entrance examinations, but Mr. Brown would probably feel no concern about that. It should be said that he confines his suggestion to Schools which have only enough pupils in Latin for four divisions. Where the pupils in any year of the course are so many as to call for division of the class, the division should always be made according to ability.

In this chapter Mr. Brown again shows some ignorance of the possibilities of accomplishment in the teaching of Latin in our Schools under present conditions, and manifests a certain Utopian doctrinarianism. He believes that the first third of the pupils

could cover in three years (presumably within the modest time-allotment that he advocates) all the Latin now read in School, and that of the first two years of the College course. He soberly estimates that this superior third might translate six books of Vergil in two months.

The final chapter makes it evident that Mr. Brown is primarily concerned with theory. He disclaims the intention of discussing the subject of this chapter, the teaching of Latin, in any other light than that of his statistics, yet he interprets the statistics as indicating that the traditional reading of the Schools is unsuitable. It will be remembered that the only tests in connected reading which he set were on passages from Caesar, and that these tests were taken by pupils in all of the last three years of the course. It might be possible to conclude from the results that Caesar cannot be read profitably for three years, if the pupils examined had been reading Caesar during all the three years.

By way of clinching his arguments, he supposes an attempt to teach English to a foreigner by the methods and with the sort of material commonly used for Latin. Is there any validity in the analogy? Are the ends sought similar? Could we, if we wished, manufacture, for Latin, the material that lies ready to our hand for English, or create the environment that in the other case is inevitable? Moreover, Mr. Brown gives no countenance to the Direct Method, and disapproves of work in composition. He suggests that the teaching of composition in the first three years of the course may be "a direct hindrance to the process of acquiring a ready and effective grasp of the thought of the Latin". What would he say of this restriction to reading in the teaching of English to a foreigner?

In this final chapter Mr. Brown returns to his attack upon the teaching of Latin grammar. He holds that pupils should "learn to translate Latin somewhat effectively,—just as they learn to talk or to read English,—before entering upon a detailed and more or less abstract study of the grammar of the language". Now, there is really no abstract study of grammar in the great majority of American Schools, if in any of them; and the amount of time given to grammar in the Schools examined during this investigation must be greatly overestimated. If it is not, the Schools need a more general investigation. It is entirely possible to teach a section of boys sorted out as the dullards of a beginning class more syntax in six months than the pupils tested by Mr. Brown had learned in four years. Furthermore, the best results for all four years were shown by the Schools which use a modified Grammatical Method—a large amount of systematic study of grammar in the first year, and attention centered upon translation after that year, with thorough drill on grammatical principles once a week in connection with a lesson in composition—the method which prevails generally throughout the country. The average score of this group of Schools was highest in thirteen of the eighteen significant items. My reckoning includes as three items the "amount correct" in the Connected Latin Test, which disregards the

amount that was incorrectly rendered. Here the Translation Method Schools had the highest score in all three years, and it is upon this score that Mr. Brown bases his claims for that method; but it may well be questioned whether it is better to translate a larger amount on such a test than to get what is translated more nearly correct.

Mr. Brown points to the "exact source of the failure" in Latin, and implies that his tests support his contention. That this is not a reasonable claim will be clear from the mere quotation of his statement of the causes of failure (137):

... (1) lack of adaptation of the subject as now taught to the needs of adolescent youth; (2) absence of the application of well-recognized principles of administration and pedagogy; (3) poor choice of the Latin material constituting the content of the course.

In another place (121) he writes:

Our present methods in Latin are not succeeding well with more than a quarter of our pupils and the chief reason is the failure to break away from traditional practices and apply the principles of modern scientific supervision and administration.

Whatever allowance is made for defects in the tests, there can be no doubt that the showing for Latin remains entirely unsatisfactory; but there is nothing in Mr. Brown's facts to warrant him in offering a program of reform as other than a personal contribution to the solution of the problem. Despite all my strictures, I believe that Latin teachers can find something of profit in this contribution. I single out as deserving of especial consideration the emphasis Mr. Brown puts upon the training of pupils to get the meaning of Latin, upon the teaching of functional grammar, and upon reading for the thought.

THE PHILLIPS EXETER ACADEMY

JOHN C. KIRTLAND

THE ANCIENT FISH-TABOO

In The Classical Journal 17.226 (January, 1922), Professor John A. Scott attempted to account for the interdict imposed on the use of fish according to the ritual of the goddess Cybele, which is discussed by Julian the Apostate in his declamation on the Mother of the Gods. Professor Scott takes the stand that this prohibition arises from the fact that the fish in the rivers of Phrygia, where the cult of Cybele originated, are—and presumably were also in ancient times—of an altogether unpalatable and unwholesome nature.

The question of the psychology of the primitive mind and the interpretation of early beliefs and practices are matters of extreme complexity. The science of folk-lore is, relatively speaking, yet in its infancy. Nevertheless, this study has been rewarded by the discovery of several very important principles. Thus, it has been shown more clearly, year by year, by sociologists and anthropologists that the primitive taboo is not, as once was supposed, concerned with any considerations of utility or expediency. Rather, the taboo is applied as the outcome of a perverse and childish system of reasoning, with which the magical

and the occult are hopelessly blended. Indeed, it appears to be quite impossible for the primitive man to differentiate the material from the supernatural; hence taboo and kindred elements arise simply from a perverted philosophy. In other words, we may expect to find no logic—according to our ideas of the term—in the mind of the savage. A pair of examples, which happen to involve the fish-taboo, will suffice to illustrate.

It was formerly the custom among the Nootka Indians of British Columbia, Canada, to abstain entirely from the eating of fish for a period of two months after they had partaken of bear-meat. Now the fish of this region are, undoubtedly, as fine as any to be found in the world; and the abstinence on the part of the Indians, we learn, had nothing to do with any fear of evil results attending a mixed diet of fish and bear's flesh. They candidly explained the taboo as arising from a concern lest the salmon and the cod should get word of their action and, being offended thereat, should refuse in the future to enter the net or take the bait (see Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, *Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild*, 2.251). The fish was taboo among the Abipones of Paraguay on the ground that it is a delicate, defenceless creature and as such would produce cowardice and sloth in those who partook of it. On the other hand, for reasons obvious enough, the Abipones were much addicted to a diet consisting of the tough, rank meat of jaguars (Frazer, 141).

Furthermore, it is clearly demonstrable that the priest places the taboo, not upon that which is unpleasant or abhorred by the barbarian, but upon just the opposite. The ban is placed upon what is *per se* pleasurable or on that which seems likely, humanly speaking, to confer a benefit. In other words, the taboo is applied for some supposedly far-seeing and supernatural reason. Likewise it is manifestly a work of supererogation to place an interdict on any act of which the evil consequences are immediately and pointedly obvious.

If, then, we assume, with Professor Scott, that the rivers of Phrygia in ancient, as well as in modern, times were filled with fish both unpalatable and unwholesome, it seems impossible to understand why any ban on fish-eating should have been thought necessary. The Phrygians must surely have avoided a fish-diet from the very nature of the circumstances, and both the principles outlined above would militate strongly against the supposition of there being any necessity for a specific taboo. It would therefore appear altogether unlikely that Professor Scott's theory would be accepted by any anthropologist or student of comparative religion.

While speculation in a field of this sort is extremely hazardous, it may be possible, I think, to suggest an alternative theory for this taboo occurring in the ritual of Cybele. While the ancient Phrygia in which this cult arose did not entirely coincide, geographically, with the later Roman territory, it is certain that the Phrygians were essentially a people of the highlands, cut off from intercourse with the sea during most of